



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

so scholarly a medium. Perhaps this is somewhat hypercritical, as they are probably beyond the sphere of any academic influence.

HUGH F. FOX.

Bayonne, N. J.

Der Ursprung des Zunftwesens und die älteren Handwerkerverbände des Mittelalters. By RUDOLPH EBERSTADT. Pp. 201. Price, 5 M. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1900.

The drastic criticisms by German writers upon Eberstadt's *Fraternitas und Magisterium* (Schmoller's *Staats und Socialwissenschaftlichen Forschungen*, xv, 2, 1897), give the present volume an unusual interest, for the subjects are closely akin.

Both from the institution of the *Magisterium* and from the *Fraternitas* Eberstadt claims there is a direct evolution into the guilds, an evolution which can be clearly traced in the sources. Hence it is in the *Magisterium* and the *Fraternitas* that he finds the origin of the guilds. The evolution proceeded step by step. The fraternities whose objects were at first purely religious and whose membership comprised men of all crafts and classes, gradually changed their character; persons of similar occupation and social standing naturally drew together into the same fraternity. This change was largely effected by the middle of the twelfth century. But the fraternities had not yet attained to the place of guilds. Their organization was extremely loose, and they had no status based on public right. During the latter half of the twelfth and the early part of the thirteenth century, however, one after another of the fraternities attained legal existence before the civil authorities and were invested with corporate rights and obligations. Thus it happened that the old fraternities were transformed into the guilds of the Middle Ages, in which the industrial and economic features superseded the religious and social. The basis for the evolution in the case of the *Magisterium* is found in the exercise of the monopoly of working or trading in a particular branch of industry (*Zunftzwang*).

It is the emphasis upon this intimate relation of the guilds with the institutions that immediately preceded them, that distinguishes the theory advanced by Eberstadt. Such an emphasis brings out the continuity of historic institutions, and is diametrically opposed to the theory of Von Belon and other authors who find the origin of the guilds entirely in the mediaeval tendency toward organization (einem lebhaften Associationstrieb) or in the monopoly privilege (*Zunftzwang*).

A marked feature of the book is its controversial character. It is polemic from beginning to end. The views of different writers on the origin of the guilds are carefully examined. The method is thoroughly

scientific, the conclusions reached being always based upon a careful study of the historic evidence. The common practice even among authors of standing, of resting many of their arguments concerning craft guilds on documentary sources in which there is no other evidence that guilds are meant than the mere mention of artisans, comes in for drastic criticism.

W. E. LINGELBACH.

University of Pennsylvania.

A History of Modern Philosophy. A Sketch of the History of Philosophy from the Close of the Renaissance to Our Own Day. By DR. HARALD HÖFFDING, Professor at the University of Copenhagen. Translated from the German edition by B. E. Meyer. Vol. I, pp. xviii, 532; Vol. II, pp. x, 600. London: Macmillan & Co., 1900.

This admirable piece of work first written in Danish and later translated into German has been in its English form for a little more than a year. Even in English it is a notable work in spite of the inaccuracies and infelicities of the translation; to these Professor Frank Thilly has called attention in the *Philosophical Review* for July, 1900.

The characteristic strength of this sketch of modern philosophy is its thoroughgoing contemporariness. Although the year 1880 was selected as the limit of time beyond which this sketch should not be carried, it is evident as one surveys its spirit and scope that it is the work of a student who appreciates the intensity, boldness, and breadth of philosophical thought in Europe and America since 1880, the work of a student who is himself master of the newer aspects of psychology and ethics.

To Professor Höffding the problems of philosophy have their roots in the theoretical and practical relations in which man stands to the universe of which he is a part (II, 563) and this double interest of philosophy leads him to give extended notice to many whose names do not appear ordinarily, or occupy only an unimportant place, in modern text books of philosophy; it leads him to give much more than the usual attention to speculative thought in ethics and politics.

Philosophical investigation according to Höffding centres in four great problems: the problem of knowledge, the problem of existence, the problem of evaluation, and the problem of consciousness. It is the third of these problems that takes him into the domain of ethics and consequently by a wider synthesis into politics and religion. The student of political and social science finds something like an adequate attention bestowed upon the development of speculative thought regarding the nature of the state and of social institutions. The second volume contains a masterly account (Book IX) of the develop-